

H

DELI

A MA

GEN

Mr.
the l
(Mr. l
the H
tradit
follow
tender
I will
could
occasi
which
a gent
—but
mende
attent
a poo
truste
the A
to be
limina
My h
call hi
opene
ing of
young
thoug
naders
the o

SPEECH
OF THE
HON. MR. BLAKE
ON THE ADDRESS.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, JANUARY 18, 1884

**A MASTERLY ADDRESS ON THE TRADE POLICY, THE RAILWAY
POLICY AND THE LAND POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT,**

BEING A
GENERAL REVIEW OF THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, although the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) closed his address to the House by declining to tender the traditional apology, I will not so far follow his example as to decline to tender the traditional compliment, and I will assure you that so far as I could judge, he has not merely, on this occasion, been provided with that which he seemed to think essential to a gentleman of his profession—a brief—but he stuck to it with a very commendable accuracy of thought and attention, and he paid, it seems to me, a poor compliment to those who entrusted him with the honor of moving the Address when he declared himself to be in want of that essential preliminary to an advocate's speech. My hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, who seconded the motion, opened his observations by complaining of the task imposed upon him as a young member, and he said that he thought from his point of view, as I understood him, it ought to be some of the older hon. members who were

more accustomed to these matters, who had had more to do with them, who were more responsible for them, who should be called upon to explain, in a fuller and more authoritative manner than he could hope to do, the topics which were under discussion. But the hon. gentleman, after having made that apology, which the hon. gentleman from Glengarry disdained to make, proceeded to discuss those matters in a manner which indicated, I think, that he was also fully equal to the task imposed upon him. There was, it is true, on one occasion at any rate, some slight discrepancy in the statements of the hon. gentleman, but, generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, I may say that both of them adhered tolerably well to the text of the document which they were asked to give their assent to, and to which they were inviting the assent of this Chamber. That document is long, but, though long, it is, perhaps, quite as remarkable for what it omits as for what it contains.

The Governor-General.

I entirely agree with the paragraph, and with the expressions upon that paragraph, which have reference to the nobleman who has been lately appointed to preside over us. It is a fortunate circumstance that for many years we should have had a succession of distinguished gentlemen as Viceroy of Canada, and it is a fortunate circumstance, also I think, that they are men who, having already approved themselves to be fit for that position, by the place they have taken in public affairs of the Mother Country, were yet men in the prime and vigour of life, fully equal to an energetic and active discharge of those functions which devolve even upon a constitutional Governor here, and of whom we may fairly expect that they come here to improve and increase their credit and reputation; to approve themselves capable of still higher positions in that public service to which they have devoted themselves; and, therefore, there is every inducement to their discharging, as those in the past have discharged, to the full their duty to the country. We do not expect, as I once before observed here, from those who come to rule over us, indiscriminate praise and eulogy, but we are entitled to expect, and I am glad to say we do receive, marks of an abiding attachment on the part of those who have remained among us for five or six years, towards this country, and a public exhibition of that abiding attachment and interest in the country, which certainly must be, as the hon. gentlemen have observed, of great advantage to us in the country to which we look for so much, in reference to our development, and our relations with which are so important.

British Columbia.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, very glad indeed to learn that some arrangements have been made, which the Government think they may with confidence submit

to Parliament, for closing all questions at issue between the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada. It would be entirely premature to discuss, in any detail, the particular arrangements with respect to which the papers are not before us, but which, we are informed, we shall certainly receive full information about within a very short time. I was a little amused to observe, however, the principles upon which this settlement, in its main feature, was based, as publicly announced by the envoy of the Administration in the Province of British Columbia. I should have supposed that the settlement was based upon a fair and liberal consideration of what the claims were of British Columbia upon Canada, but I find that it was not so—that it was upon other considerations—upon the considerations of the claims of the City of Victoria upon the First Minister. I quote from the report of the speech of the Minister of Justice at Victoria, in which he announced that result:

"With reference to the Settlement Bill, as it is called by the Local Administration, Sir Alexander Campbell assured the deputation, reiterating the language of his colleague, Sir John Macdonald, that the Government of the Dominion has every intention to see that the line between Esquimalt and Nanaimo is constructed. This, Sir John A. considers a debt which he owes to Victoria, for the confidence placed in him by the electors, when they returned him as their representative."

Mr. Speaker, an honest man pays his debts, but he pays them with his own money. But the hon. gentleman proposes to pay his debts, incurred in the constituencies which honor him with their confidence, at our expense, and this is formally announced in the course of the discussion which results in the settlement which is to be brought before us. I was a little amused, also, to observe that the arrangement involves a

SURRENDER TO THE AMERICANS.

I find
corpo
the Isl
compos
are v
and w
memb
prised
the U
the nar
the nar
name o
familia
the Pa
try virt
nection
with w
are co
propose
and var
the con
are use
no dou
recent
with th
I hope
tremely
when h
whose
and I
other m
cuss—t
should
pened i
same pa
try.

Now,
North-V
that is
of the
rapid in
taken pl
sitateso
of the la
the hou
with th
think, i
to comp
sions th
the inn
Upon fo
at an e

I find that a large company is incorporated for the construction of the Island Railway, and that it is composed of sundry magnates who are very well known to fame, and who are interested, the hon. member for Glengarry may be surprised to hear, in the hostile railway—the Union Pacific Railway. I find the name of C. B. Huntingdon; I find the name of Mr. Gregory; I find the name of Mr. Stanford. I find names familiar to most of us, as magnates of the Pacific coast—kings of that country virtually by reason of their connection with the Pacific Railway—with whom hon. gentlemen opposite are contracting, and to whom they propose to surrender the coal lands and various privileges connected with the construction of the railway. They are useful persons to deal with, I have no doubt, as the publication of the recent correspondence in connection with the Pacific Railway proves, and I hope the hon. gentleman was extremely careful to caution his colleague when he dealt with these gentlemen, whose letters are before me in part, and I would read them if I had no other matters of importance to discuss—to caution him that such thing should not happen in Canada as happened in railway negotiations with the same parties in the neighbouring country.

The North-West.

Now, the Speech alludes to the North-West, and the only reference that is made to the general condition of the country is a reference to the rapid increase of population which has taken place, and which is said to necessitate some further amendment of some of the laws affecting the territory. But the hon. gentlemen who were supplied with the brief on this occasion had, I think, in this particular, some reason to complain, because upon former occasions the brief contained the figures for the immigration to the North-West. Upon former occasions we were told at an early day, by the authority of

the Government conveyed to those hon. gentlemen, what the figures were for the year. We have not got them for this year. Total figures have been given us; figures had been given us with reference to immigration to the United States, but we are not told what the increase to the population of the North-West was. Is it uncharitable in me to conjecture that it is because the figures given last year have not been verified by results? Is it because there would be an unpleasant contrast between the figures of 75,000, exclusive of the suggested Irish immigration *en masse*, which we were told would enter the North-West last year, and the results? I think we might know, even to day, whether those steps were taken which for two or three years have been pressed on the hon. gentleman, and which last year he promised me very faithfully he would see fulfilled, for the admeasurement of the actual settlement in that country. Up to this time my opinion is, as I have said before, that the principle of calculation upon which he has proceeded is one which is purely conjectural, and which does not actually measure what the settlement of the country was. Well, we have not, as I have said, the figures, and so, although the Speech has told us that there is a rapid increase of population; although the hon. gentlemen were instructed as to the figures in other parts, we were not told how rapid that increase has been which interests this legislation. Now, there is nothing more, as I have said, on the North-West, but much more ought to have been said, and here it is that complain a little of the silence of those who have proposed to assent to this Speech, as well as of the absence of a statement in the Address itself. We know that there is more to be said about the North-West; we know that there is disappointment; we know that

THERE IS DISCONTENT ;

we know that there is agitation and difficulty there; we know that many things which a year ago we pointed out, which for several years we have been pointing out, would tend to create discontent in that country, are creating trouble and discontent, and that no word is said to the task which is to devolve upon this Parliament of considering these great questions, and of taking care that so far as they may be remediable the causes of that discontent may be remedied. Hon. gentlemen may say, no; it is nothing, it is merely a tempest in a teapot; it is something that is not serious. But I observe the Prime Minister of that Province a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, only the other day, at one of the banquets that are given to Members of Parliament in Winnipeg, and of one of which I believe the hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) was the fortunate recipient, followed immediately afterwards by a banquet, participated in by the hon. member for Wellington—I observed so late as the 9th of January the Prime Minister of the Province is reported to have said:

"At present we are on the verge of a crisis from which we must emerge in a better or worse condition. Not, however, until the masses were made aware of the situation would they stand up and maintain their rights. The time had arrived when Manitoba must be placed on a level with the other Province of the Dominion."

He referred to the cry that Manitoba was petted and pampered, and said:

"Not one new arrival had been in the Province three months before he, who before was loud in its denunciations, was equally loud in demanding its rights. The eyes of the farmers had been opened, and they were alarmed at the prospect. These matters would shortly engross the attention, not only of the Provincial, but of the Dominion Parliament."

That is the statement which the First Minister made at a recent period in reference to the condition of that

country, but of it we have heard no word, either in the Speech delivered to us or in the observations of the hon. gentlemen who have indicated the general run of the discussion for this Session. Now, we know that the policy of the administration in that country—one particular part of their administrative policy—could not be effectively criticised during last Session for the reason that the papers which were demanded were not brought down. I refer to the papers connected with the

CLOSING OF LAND IN SOUTHERN MANITOBA.

They were asked for, and the order was promised, but they have not reached the House, and by consequence, it was impossible to engage in a discussion upon that subject. It is enough to say that that order has been reversed, and that at a very late period the policy which had dictated, most improperly and wrongly, the closing of southern Manitoba to settlement, has been changed. I have observed that the ordinary sources of information on the part of newspapers which support the Government have praised each of these transactions. When southern Manitoba and the mile belt were closed, it was a wise and statesman-like thing. When it was attempted to sell, by public auction, these lands, that also was a wise statesman-like and a proper thing. But when the policy for closing was reversed, when the policy of selling was reversed, and when once again they were opened, that was the wisest and most patriotic, the most sensible thing of all. Well, I believe it was. But it seems to me hon. gentlemen are easily satisfied if, with all these various policies in the course of a short few months, they are equally placed as each one is presented. Sir, the policy did not last a long time, but it lasted long enough to do a great deal of harm. There

were nu
upon ho
who ha
keeping
continu
that the
opened
expect, a
of it; wh
to go on
disappoi
were ma
attempt
the reser
ation ha
planatio
I believe
important
the North
set-back
than the
when, the
were att
people of
traoted t
authoriti
extends l
toba. W
locking u
ments wh
age to be
ation con
hon. gen
formed th
arrangem
asserted
affected
whether
immateri
of contro
which w
homestea
ment wa
larger ex
indicate.
this polic
reserved
is not n
believe, a
suspendi
for colon
know th
if the

it we have heard no the Speech delivered observations of the who have indicated of the discussion for now, we know that the administration in the particular part of the policy—could not criticised during last reason that the paper demanded were not I refer to the papers

IN SOUTHERN MANITOBA.

ked for, and the ised, but they have e House, and by was impossible to sion upon that sub- gh to say that that versed, and that at a the policy which had properly and wrongly, uthern Manitoba to en changed. I have ordinary sources of e part of newspapers e Government have these transactions. Manitoba and the osed, it was a wise ke thing. When it sell, by public auc- that also was a wise nd a proper thing. policy for closing was the policy of selling and when once again that was the wisest e, the most sensible ell, I believe it was me hon. gentlemen ed if, with all these in the course of a s, they are equally one is present- policy did not last a lasted long enough al of harm. There

were numerous persons who had settled upon homesteads in southern Manitoba who had a right to expect that the keeping of that country open would be continuous; who had a right to expect that the neighbouring lands would be opened for homesteading; who did expect, and who went there on the faith of it; who communicated with friends to go on and join them, and who were disappointed in their expectations, as were many of those who did go and attempt to join them, by the closing of the reserves. Of that step no explanation has been given. I think an explanation is due to the country, because I believe it is to be one of the not unimportant causes of the difficulties in the North-West, and to have created a set-back which will last much longer than the policy itself has lasted. Well, then, there were other difficulties which were attracting the attention of the people of that country, and have attracted the attention of the constituted authorities of that portion of it which extends beyond the bounds of Manitoba. We complained of the policy of locking up lands by the lavish arrangements which were made as to the acreage to be granted to various colonization companies. We pointed out the hon. gentleman was repeatedly informed that the practical results of the arrangements was that the companies asserted in some shape or other, and effected in some shape or other—whether by law or without law was immaterial to the purpose—some sort of control or check over those lands which were said to continue open to homesteading, and the general settlement was interfered with to a much larger extent than hon. gentlemen indicate. It was not very long after this policy was adopted that it, too, was reserved by the Government itself. It is not many months ago since, I believe, an Order in Council was passed suspending a further grant of lands for colonization purposes, and we know that the very great bulk of the companies which were

organized have utterly failed. But there, too, their policy and the consequent opening of these lands for settlement or sale has not prevented a mischief from being done, because at a time when the eyes and expectations of numerous people were upon that country, and when there was a strong desire to settle, difficulties were thrown in the way of settlers and the progress of the country was seriously checked. I have said that the constituted authorities of the North-West have protested against the companies which were in active operation, and I believe amongst the remonstrances which were forwarded to the Government, is one which is from the North-West Council, in reference to the operation of the policy and the operations of a particular company. Well, there were other causes of discontent, to which also we have referred. We pointed out that the settler in that country, although when he first came there he would treat as part of his capital expenditure, as part of his investment, the expenses of transport and the necessary incidentals to the first settlement, yet would he be found seriously inconvenienced, as a rule, by these necessary expenses; that in that country, having the great advantage of the settler being able to plough without clearing, there were other initial expenses—expenses connected with buildings, fences, &c., which were to be set, to some extent, against that advantage, and that the remoteness of the country, the expenses of transport, and these initial expenses, certainly demanded the greatest consideration on the part of the authorities who believed, as I think this House at large believes, as I think the country believes, that what is really for the interest of the country is that the North West should, at the earliest moment, be settled with a thriving, industrious, prosperous, and contented agricultural population. We pointed out that there would be financial difficulty in the way of the settler; and yet in the face of that difficulty, great as was, with the finan-

cial burdens imposed on him, the Government took the step of increasing those tariff burdens at the last Session.

Provincial Railway Charters.

Then there was the further difficulty in connection with the disallowance of the Provincial railway charters within the bounds of the old Province of Manitoba; a course which, as I have pointed out more than once is, in my view, a derogation of the rights of the Province as a member of the Confederation, is not called for by the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and is opposed to the express declaration made on the subject when the contract was being passed through the House. And the result of this difficulty, of the check in looking elsewhere which the Government has interposed, has been that the people of that country have now their eyes turned towards the Hudson Bay, and they are anxious, even desirous, that their boundaries shall be extended and their large obligations increased by the Government and Parliament, on the faith and credit of the people of a new Province, already struggling under considerable difficulties necessarily incident to the settlement of a new country, in order that a railway may be built to that Bay, and they may thus obtain some means of escape from the grievances which they feel to be so serious in regard to railway communication. I will not enlarge on the consequences of the scheme if it be successful. I am sure that after what has been said in regard to the Pacific Railway contract and the means of outlet and inlet to that country, the hon. Minister of Railways will be found assisting to the utmost of his power the Hudson Bay Railway; and whatever the consequences may be to us in the east, it is impossible that we can refuse to those people any means of ingress or egress opened to them in that direction. It is quite true with respect to this very question of the monopoly and consequent high rates,

that some redress has lately been accorded. Within a few days a very important reduction has been made in the tariff on grain carried over the Canadian Pacific Railway. And I am very glad to know it; it is a fortunate omen. It indicates that the company is accessible to the remonstrances of the people, when sufficiently loudly expressed; but it indicates also that those complaints which were made as to the tariff were sound complaints. It indicates that the Tariff was too high; or else why was the reduction made? It indicates, therefore, that the grievance which we said would arise has arisen, and at any moment may recur. On the whole, this subject, to which the hon. gentleman has thought fit not to give any attention in the Speech from the Throne, and which the hon. members who moved and seconded the Address in reply, thought unworthy of notice, seems to be a very serious one, one of the most serious which we have before us. It seems to me that history is repeating itself, and that the same Government, presided over by the same hon. First Minister, which a number of years ago, in the early history of our connection with the North-West, imperilled that connection by its course of administration; has done much to thwart the progress and check the feelings of cordiality and kindness which ought to exist between the people of that district and the people of the rest of the Dominion.

Canadian Pa.

With respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have indicated that the Speech contains matter in truth on which we ought to congratulate ourselves. We have heard much of the immense exertions which the company have made, of the great work which they have done, and we are told it is of the last consequence that the railway should be completed

has lately been
a few days a very
on has been made in
in carried over the
o Railway. And
to know it; it
n. It indicates that
accessible to the re-
the people, when
expressed; but it in-
ose complaints which
he tariff were sound
indicates that the
; or else why was the
It indicates, there-
vance which we said
arisen, and at any
our. On the whole,
hich the hon. gentle-
it not to give any at-
tch from the Throne,
hon. members who
ded the Address in
unworthy of notice,
serious one, one of
hich we have before
me that history is re-
nd that the same
ided over by the same
ter, which a number
e early history of our
he North West, im-
ection by its course
; has done much to
ss and check the feel-
and kindness which
ween the people of
he people of the rest

in Pa

the Canadian Pac-
e hon. gentlemen
en have indicated
contains matter in
we ought to con-
s. We have heard
se exertions which
made, of the great
have done, and we
he last consequence
should be completed

within two years from the present time. Mr. Speaker, I consider the statement made in the Speech to be one of a grave and alarming character. It informs us that during the recess of Parliament the Government took the responsibility of arranging for the guarantee of the interest at a certain rate upon \$65,000,000 of the stock of the railway, on receiving cash and securities. That was a transaction which, as I understand it, was not authorized by the law. The Government no doubt, has power to sell terminable annuities, but their power to sell them is contained in legislation, which enables them to do that for the purpose of obtaining cash to pay our debts; and I do not understand that they have power to issue terminable annuities in exchange for anything else but that; and therefore, in so far as this was a transaction in which what the Government received was securities and not cash, I am not familiar with any clause of any Act of Parliament which justifies that step. But if it were justified, it was a very grave step to take. It involved a very large transaction, and we have not yet before us any indication whatever as to what these securities were; what the *quid pro quo* was, what the consideration was in respect of which the Government undertook this particular obligation. The transaction is said to have been justified, accomplished as it was within a comparatively brief date of the meeting of Parliament, by the importance to the country of steadying and increasing the value of the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. And I have no doubt, as has happened before with other Governments,—and it is the ordinary recourse under such circumstances—had it succeeded, its justification would have been said to have been its success; but it has not got that poor justification for a step of this description; for, instead of having succeeded, it is said to have failed. And, indeed, I am unable to perceive how, if it were true that for every dollar

guaranteed a dollar of tangible and available securities was handed over by the company, which might otherwise have been used, the transaction, although it might enhance the price of existing stock for the purpose of buying and selling, could not be said to have the elements of permanent success. If, on the other hand, we are to give without getting, that is a different transaction. But no new plan is indicated. We are told the particular plan which the Government adopted has failed, and we are told that we are to expect something or other in substitution for it. The reason that is given for this is a single reason: It is said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are about to anticipate the period at which it was to complete the work, and that in order to anticipate that period the company require, at an earlier date, I suppose, and perhaps to a larger extent, cash than it would otherwise require. We all recollect the boasts that have been indulged in for the past two years, as to this anticipation of the work. We recollect the glorifications in which hon. gentlemen opposite indulged as to the standing and financial strength and connections of the corporators of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We recollect the sense of relief which they expressed themselves to feel and in which they asked the House to participate, and the country to indulge, as to the burden lifted off our shoulders and placed on the shoulders of men who were able willing, and ready to bear it; and then when they came to be, as hon. gentlemen said, "better than their word"—when it was alleged that the company were going to anticipate the termination of the contract—we were told that while this would be good for the country, it was done in the interest of the company, because it would be good also for them; because they believed it was a wise policy to anticipate the period fixed for the completion of the Railway. They said, we rejoice at it and call upon you all to rejoice and full

down and worship the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government which has created it and which is overshadowed by the glory of its doings. For two years it has been dinned into our ears that this corporation was about to complete the road. Now it turns out that the Parliament of Canada is to be called on to enable them to do it; that it is to the Parliament and the people of Canada they are to look for further assistance of an indefinite character to enable them to execute their contract in the form and manner which they deem to be most advantageous for themselves. Now, I have, on former occasions, standing here, pointed out from time to time what the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway was from the statement of the company themselves. I have pointed out what the cost of their road would be, according to their own calculations; what the value of their subsidies of various descriptions was, according to their own calculations; what the balance would be according to their own calculations. And hon. gentlemen opposite have said, well, it is very important, it is extremely favourable to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I, however have been obliged to point out, and I did so last Session on more than one occasion, that it was not the magnitude of their subsidies or the excellence of the position accorded to the company under the contract which would relieve the enterprise from risk if prudent management did not attend its execution, and amongst the points of difficulty was this very one of a too rapid prosecution of the work. Speed means cost, and you cannot press a work beyond a certain point, as was proved in former discussions on this very subject, and as shown very clearly by the report of the former chief Engineer of the road. without the cost being very largely enhanced. We are told that the speed has not only been great but that it has been unprecedented in the history of railway building; and

if speed means cost what does unprecedented speed mean? It is clear that the work has cost more than it would have cost had it been prosecuted more slowly. You cannot suddenly obtain the supply of labour required for such a purpose to an extent double or treble what would be required for slower progress, without raising the cost of labour, and in that regard, as in other regards, as I have said, I repeat, speed means cost. The early completion of the work, its completion at so early a date as is talked of, of course accelerates the period of less profitable working. We have not all of us yet forgotten the statements by which the price to be paid the company was justified. It was said, there is to be a long period after the completion of the road before you can get any settlement and develop the traffic during which the working will be remunerative, and for which we have to compensate, in advance, by paying a larger price, and that is included in the sum of the price we paid. But accelerated construction, accelerated completion, means, of course, the acceleration of the point of that very unprofitable working to which hon. gentlemen allude. It means more. It does not merely accelerate the point of commencement, but it intensifies the character of the unprofitableness of the working, because the faster you build, the fewer years you allow for the development of the country, the development of the trade, the introduction of a population to sustain the railway when it is built, obviously the greater are the difficulties of working when you complete. Nor am I able to agree that the extreme rapidity which has been used and which is intended to be used, has done real good to the country. I am not able to agree in that view, and I think if the hon. gentleman would enquire in the North West he would find that that sentiment is largely entertained. Amongst the difficulties of settling that country, is the difficulty of isolation, the sparseness of the settlements;

and what has been done by the extreme rapidity of construction has been to increase that difficulty as well. People have been scattered over a wide expanse of country in which their difficulties have been made greater by this cause; and they have been induced to look rather to the chance of some fortunate location turning out to be a town site, or a mine, than to the steady development of the agricultural resources of the country, upon which its future must, after all, depend; which steady development will be greatly favoured by comparative density of settlement, and as seriously hindered by sparseness of settlement. Now, there is a defence of course, and that defence is the boom; but I do not know that the boom has done the North-West much good either; I do not know that the great balloon which the hon. gentleman set floating in the air, which looked so splendid, and to which they directed all eyes, presents the same flourishing appearance to-day; and I believe the future of that country has, upon the whole, not merely not been helped, but has been seriously retarded by the course of inflation and speculation which their policy in this and other respects invited and encouraged; and that, therefore, it cannot be said in respect to the boom any more than in other respects that this rapidity of construction which induced the boom, and which we now learn is to be had at our cost instead of the cost of the company, was an advantage to the North-West. Hon. gentlemen say in the Speech that the reason of the guarantee is the need to sell the unissued stock. Without entering on this occasion, into details, I must say that I do not find that statement very much in accord with the statements which are officially made by the president and by the vice-president of the company, from which it appears that their other resources, irrespective of the unused stock, would be adequate to the construction of the road. It is said that the stock is not saleable at

its fair market price. Now, I moved for, and the House ordered, papers on this subject, but the information which was ordered has not been brought before us. We know that the stock nominally is \$100,000,000. We know that the original issue was said first to be sixty, but I believe that later information is more accurate, which places as the price at which the syndicate, to whom it was entrusted, received it at fifty, and therefore the stock is issued at about one half its nominal value. We know from the newspapers, if the market reports are to be trusted, that it has been selling at a premium which has varied from fifty to sixty, occasionally going up above sixty, meaning a premium of from ten to twenty or twenty-five. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that is not enough, that it should sell at the highest premium on its issue price, and as it will not, let us make up the difference. Now, I maintain that amongst the information which is essential in order to Parliament's intelligent consideration of any plan or scheme for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, is the fullest information of all transactions in connection with this stock. We have discussed the subject before, and I have pointed out the inferences which are to be drawn from such meagre information as we have. We have called for further papers, and I ask that these papers should be speedily brought down, and that, as part of the *cause justificative* of this proposed transaction, we should know how it is that \$45,000,000 or \$55,000,000 is the actual sum of what has been received from them. But that is not the only difficulty which, as it seemed to me, was brought on the company by the policy of that corporation, aided and encouraged and backed by the Government of the day, in taking that course. I have pointed out before, and I repeat, that this contract, large and liberal as were the subsidies that were granted, and extensive as were the privileges, which were allotted to the

corporators, was one of great magnitude—one which required the undivided energy and devotion of those engaged in it, to the completion of the contracted line; and I have pointed out that the time, the energy, the capital, the credit and the resources of the company have been largely devoted to objects not embraced within the limits of the contracted line. Some of these are more justifiable than others; but of all of them it is to be said that they are transactions in respect of which, if the company entered into them at all, it was to be expected that they would not be entered into, to the detriment of any one of the elements of success, to which I have referred, in the

CONTRACTED LINE.

Take the Canada Central; the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental; the Laurentian; the St. Lawrence and Ottawa; the Atlantic and North-Western; the Ontario and Quebec; the Credit Valley, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce; the Hamilton and North Western; the London Junction; the South Eastern; irrespective of the Algoma Mills Branch, the North-West branches and North-West lines,—in most of these it is established that the company have meddled in one way or other; and in others it is asserted, and I believe rightly, that they have also meddled, in some to a greater, in some to a less extent. The capital involved in the acquisition of these various lines runs into the tens of millions, amounting to probably as much as \$30,000,000; and I attribute to a great portion of the difficulties in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are now confessedly involved, to the circumstance that they have engaged in matters not contracted for in their contract, and that with the capital which was directly due to the performance of the contract, they have done much more than the contract demanded, and have done that more in their own interest. I pointed out also that the course which

was pursued in proposing to construct another railway in competition with the other great railway of the country, through Ontario, would almost inevitably have the result it has had, and would invite the hostility of that other railway, to the detriment of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I regretted, and I repeat the regret, that that hostile attitude should have existed. I know not whether it now exists but I maintain that it was hardly expected that it should be avoided when this competition, which was not necessary to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway proper, was engaged in. In all these things, and for all these things, the Government have had a large part and have assumed a large responsibility; they have promoted, encouraged, and aided them; they have supported them by granting all the assistance, all the legislation that was desired to give these additional powers; they encouraged them by the method of distributing the subsidies in the original contract—by granting an inordinate amount towards the prairie section instead of reserving it for those difficult ends of the work which are yet to be completed, and in respect to which we are to be asked to deal still more lavishly. We contended that the subsidies should be distributed in accordance with the cost of the respective portions of the work. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: No, we want to put the company into a first-class position, and we will give them what is admitted to be a disproportionate part of the subsidy at the beginning. That is what they did, and the results have been just as we predicted. And, Sir, while this is so while at this early period, after making the contract, the Government are obliged to make the melancholy statement contained in the Speech, we did not hear one word in connection with that statement in reference to the invitation to be given to us to modify the terms of the contract, or any proposal to annex any

condition for the relief of the country by the removal or mitigation of those obnoxious portions of the contract which are more oppressive to the community than profitable to the corporation. Sir, I will not enter into other topics connected with the Railway. But as I take a view entirely opposite to that taken by the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Address, as to the condition of things developed by the paragraph, I felt it necessary to say so much.

Condition of the Country.

The Speech refers to the condition of the country and it tells us that the harvest has been less productive than some of its predecessors, and that there has been, owing to the rapid expansion of our commerce, some little over-trading; but it asserts that there is a general condition of prosperity. I congratulate the hon. member of Glengarry upon the dexterous manner—borrowed, I dare say, from his avocations in other spheres to which he alluded—in which he slipped over the remark. He did it very well. He felt that the least said the soonest mended, and he got on the ice and off it as fast as possible. I do not know that he got upset, but it appears to me he ran a considerable risk of it. We remember the admirable exhibitions made by speakers on former occasions, when they were developing this part of the usual Speech from the Throne. If we remember the beautiful exhibitions afforded to us, first by the mover, and then by the seconder, as late as last Session; if we remember the length of time they took in their performance; if we remember the ease and grace, and the apparent delight and joy with which they dwelt upon the condition of the country on that occasion, and contrast it with the hon. gentleman's dart in and dart out again, we must feel that in this particular he knew his business; but we must also

feel that the contrast is a little more serious—a little more serious, in fact, that even the Speech from the Throne has told us. In truth, the

High Tariff Policy

of hon. gentlemen opposite, has proved it self largely a failure. The period of good times, to which we are naturally entitled, came to us a little later on account of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it has left us much sooner than it ought to have done. We had two or three years of it, during which there were good crops, good markets, a good lumber trade, large railway and other expenditure; during which the people grew more wealthy, importations crept up and the circumstances were such as hon. gentlemen were pleased to dilate upon in the debate on the Address. Now the conditions are changed. They are sadly changed. Why are they changed? And why are they changed so soon? I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite as to the deficient harvest; I agree that they did not incorrectly express the degree of depression which is due to that cause. There has been a very good harvest in very many parts of the country. There has been an abundant harvest in many parts of the country. In one section of the Province from which I come—over a large region of it—one of its main staple crops has, no doubt, lamentably failed; but other crops have done well in that section, and in the eastern portion of Ontario even that crop, so far as it was grown, has done fairly well. In Manitoba, as we know, owing to an unfortunate circumstance which we must all deplore, a portion, although not a very large portion, of the cereal whose cultivation is to be the staple of that country, was frozen, and the difficulty ensued; but barring these two points, there is no doubt that although the crop is not to be described as equal to that of the preceding years, we have not been subjected to the calamity of a very bad

crop all over the Dominion. The crop is inferior, but not a failure, and has followed a very brief period of prosperity, during which we had good crops and good prices, and a good lumber market. Surely then, the great policy which was to do so much for this country; which was to give us steadiness of prosperity, steadiness of employment to our working men; which was to ensure to us a permanent condition of prosperity, in so far as anything can ensure it, ought to have carried us over one partial failure of a crop. But what has happened is very serious, and it is not to be accounted for by the crop. It is due to other circumstances more in control of the Administration than is the crop. I have observed on former occasions, that while hon. gentlemen opposite, addressing the people in the country, would not absolutely tell a farmer that the crops were in their own hands, that they could cause the sun to shine, and the rain to fall, and the crop to grow, they had yet said—and the hon. gentleman who is laughing has himself said:—after all, you had better vote for the Government that the sun shines on; Providence is kind to us: "When the Grits come in," said the hon. First Minister, "the weevil will come in with them." Thus they have told the poor people of the country who have, some of them, confided in them, that there was some sort of high compact and alliance between them and the supernal powers under which, by means not to be disclosed to vulgar ears, yet none the less effective, good crops were coincident with the existence of a Tory Administration. I do not suppose they will take credit for that any longer. Even although they have failed so slightly, even although the crop has not been so very bad, I believe they are now much more disposed to attribute the alternations of prosperity and adversity to conditions beyond their control, and a crop beyond their control, than they were in former days. But I deny that the change in affairs is to

be mainly, though to a considerable extent it is, to be attributed to such causes. It is, to be attributed to the policy of the Administration—a policy, in the first place, of extravagant expenditure under which they took and spent; a policy, in the second place, of extravagant collection under which they took what even their extravagance could not enable them to expend, under which they determined to abstract from the people of the country, in these years that have lately passed and the current year, about \$20,000,000, which will cost the people of the country—the consumers—by the time they pay it, something approximating to \$30,000,000, and which they used in order to pay for this same Canadian Pacific Railway that once more dresses the Speech from the Throne; a policy, under which, instead of borrowing at four per cent the \$20,000,000 they wanted, they have caused the people to pay \$30,000,000 at something like seven or eight per cent. They thus abstracted from the people, at the period they wanted it, something which made the difference between a good and a bad crop which we suffer from Providence, they have brought on us what is equivalent to the failure of another crop. They took what they did take unjustly and unequally. They did more. They invited and encouraged over-speculating and over-trading. They fomented the North-West speculations by the land arrangements which they made. The hon. Minister, instead of being a prudent pilot, told his crew that if he were only as young as they and in trade he would clap on full sail for a period of ten years of assured prosperity and then take in sail. How many of his crew have taken in sail since, although the ten years have not elapsed? How many of his crew have gone down under the sail which he told them to hoist and keep up for a ten year's voyage!

They unduly stimulated every pet industry. What of the cotton industry! the

sugar industry! the iron industry! and the glass industry! and half a dozen other things I could mention which hon. gentlemen placed under their hot-bed system, and in respect of which they brought up numerous plants, and which have now largely withered. Their policy resulted in over-investment in manufacture, over-production, over-trading, over-importation; and had not others been wiser than the hon. Minister of Finance; had not others set that caution signal which he declined to set, the consequences would have been much more serious than they actually were. If they were not more serious it is due to this circumstance. I trust that the check which was administered by some leading men who had a better knowledge of the signs of the times than the hon. gentleman, who were better able to judge the course of events than he—I say, the check they endeavoured to give the administration one and a half years ago, and have been repeating ever since, has mitigated the disaster which might otherwise have occurred. I trust it is limited to a period of stringency and dullness without being advanced as it would have been to a period of crisis and collapse. If it be so, it is due to others and not to the Finance Minister; and even as it is, it is bad enough. It was only last Session that the hon. gentleman who moved the reply to the Address averted to the list of bankruptcies as an indication of the continued prosperity of the country. I pointed out to him that I thought he had not referred to the authorities or he would have followed, by anticipation, the prudent course which has been taken on this occasion and omitted reference to the subject. Although there was last year an increase instead of, as the hon. gentleman, supposed, a diminution, still the amount was moderate. Though enough to warn people and cause them to be cautious, it was not enough to indicate a then existing condition of a very serious character. What is the roll call to-

day! You find that the number has enormously increased, about double, if I remember aright. You find that the amount of liabilities is between two and three times the amount of last year, according to one of the commercial reports, and between four or five times as much, according to the other; you find that comparing our condition with that of the neighbouring republic, we have nearly twice as many, in proportion to those engaged in trade, who have succumbed under the excessive load which they were carrying under the hon. gentleman's advice, as they have on the other side. The hon. gentleman has adverted on former occasions to the bank stocks as an indication of the prosperity of the country. He said the other day, out in the country, that he did not do so during his Budget Speech last year, because he thought they were rather high. What does he think now? What does he think of the loss of some ten or twelve millions at least—in value since they touched that point? What does that indicate in relation to the condition of the country? What did a rise in stock indicate? He said advancing prosperity. What does a fall so serious indicate? I leave it to him to answer. And then we might make an enquiry as to the condition of the pet industries. Pride and rejoicing were manifested in past years on the ground of their vigour and prosperity. The hon. gentleman spoke of them as things of which the country ought to be proud. It is true the people might be paying a little more, though they disputed that, but what was that when you found men engaged so vigorously in home production, and employing so many hands, and paying such liberal wages, and giving such constant employment, and making such large donations to charitable objects, and generally prospering so much? What is the condition of the pet industries to day? Has that unhealthy stimulation which we said would take place under the hot-bed Tariff of high prices, done good or harm? Has it

not had the result we predicted, and are we not reaping at an earlier day than even we predicted, and at a much earlier day than he expected, when he made his prophecies, the bitter harvest of his policy? What is the condition, under the National Policy to-day, of the great industry of flour-milling in Canada? How does it stand? How does the Tariff affect it? Has the hon. gentleman accommodated his little difference with the millers? Is he about to relieve them from the difficulties under which they say they labour and which prevent them, they say, from grinding American flour in Canada? Has the result of this Tariff proved itself to be a result sound and just as applied to this country in that regard? How is it with reference to the balance of trade? Why, I remember when the hon. gentleman pointed out with pride and glory, I think only two years ago—

An hon. member. Three years.

Mr. BLAKE. Three years was it? That for the first time in the history of Canada the balance of trade was in its favour that we had exported more than we imported, and he told us what he had accomplished, and he told us how he had accomplished it. And before that he had pointed out what his duty was in that regard. He told us at an earlier period that we had to attain to a different condition of things from that which had existed before. It is true it was not very bad. It is true the amount of our importation was not very large. But the hon. gentleman, in 1879, said: "Regarding the matter as I do, I think it is to be regretted that the volume of imports has not been materially reduced." Reduced from its volume then, reduced from the small volume that then existed. "I look upon the large imports ever since the Dominion was organized, showing a large balance of trade against it, as one of the causes of trouble with which we have to contend, one of the difficulties that it is our duty to remedy. They have been decreasing to a certain extent, but are still very large"—how

do they compare with those of last year showing distinctly and clearly, in my judgment, that they ought to be still further diminished. I think then, without entering into a discussion of Free Trade and Protection, so far as they affect England and the United States, we may fairly conclude that the prosperity of the one country at this moment, is caused in a great measure by the large surplus in its favour, and the depression in the other, by the large deficiency. He then gives the figures, and concludes "under these circumstances, it appears to me that we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing the volume of imports from all parts of the world." Having declared his duty, having proposed to perform it, having rejoiced three years ago in the success which has attended his efforts, I want to know, to-day, what has happened to the National Policy? Is it asleep? Has it gone on a journey? How was it last year and the year before together? How does it compare with the balance of trade in the year when he complained so much?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Very well.

Mr. BLAKE. I know, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman will do. I know him of old, Sir. He will take a lot of averages. He is great on averages. He does not mind the story that the figures tell, if you look at their consecutive order, but he will take them back and forth, and will take the average of a number of years. But we are speaking of the year 1879, when he spoke of the then existing condition of things, and the subsequent years, when he spoke of what was his duty to do and what he had accomplished, and we are comparing the year preceding 1879 and the condition of things to-day, as to the volume of imports and the balance of trade; we are comparing it in a progressive manner. He had obtained perfection three years ago, but now I suppose he will average the three years, and say, "What have you to do

with the returns of last year! Look at the average."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; we will take both.

The Domestic Loan.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, besides the other progeny of the hon. gentleman, he brought fourth a little domestic loan this year. He thought the people did not know what to do with the rest of their money. After he had taken \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000, as I have pointed out, from them more than was required, he said, "Gentlemen, there is something left in your pockets, and I believe that you had better let me have it at four per cent," and the hon. gentleman's organs pointed out with a great flourish of trumpets what a wonderful and prescient Government this was, that proposed a domestic loan at four per cent, and how wise a step it was. Well, the advertisement issued, and the time elapsed, and there was what they call "an awful pause," and the news came out that the loan had failed; and then the hon. gentleman's organs said, "What a wonderful Finance Minister this is; he knew it was better for the country that the loan should fail, and it is a most fortunate circumstance that the loan has failed." But the hon. gentleman was not content with that, he was determined to give a crowning proof of his titles to our confidence, and, as the people would not take the loan at par, he put up the rate at a premium of two and a half per cent., and the organs said, "This is the wisest thing of all." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to believe that the farmers of the country are beginning to perceive the hollowness of the hon. gentleman's plans for making them rich. I am inclined to believe that the working men are beginning to see that his Tariff is not a tariff which protects labour or which gives continuity of employment, as was promised. Why, if the hon. gentleman would enquire as to these operatives

who have been dismissed during the last few months from some of these pet industries, I dare say they would tell him some plain truths which would do him a great deal of good. It is quite true that his organs, true to their duty to him, to prove that he is always mindful of the workingman above all, pointed out that the workingman had been working too hard for some years, that he actually had become overworked and run down and wanted a holiday, and it was the best thing that could happen to him, just as it was the best thing for the country that the hon. gentleman's loan failed, to have a little slack time at the mill, so that he might go home and repose himself in the bosom of his family, and spend some of his surplus earnings; but I have not heard that the workingman has sympathized much with that view of the case. In Toronto city, from which I come, there is a very great deal of distress; there is more distress than I have known there for many years, due in part to special and exceptional circumstances, to which I will have to refer, and due also very largely to other circumstances to which I have alluded, and if hon. gentlemen would read the reports of those who interest themselves in the charity relief organizations of that city, they would find an account very different from that which they may be disposed to give us. So of Montreal, in which the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) I believe, resides. It was but the other day that I was reading a report of a St. George's Society, as to the condition of things there. As to London, I do not know what the hon. Postmaster General will say about it, but I find, positively, Mr. Speaker, I find that they are proposing to establish what industry do you think, now?

Soup Kitchens.

Why, Sir, a soup kitchen, and who do you think proposed it? Why it is the hon. gentleman's organ, the leading

Conservative paper in the western part of the Province, the *London Free Press*, which, on January 5th, remarked:

"The present cold weather must be severely felt by many. The poor, 'who are always with us,' have certain means of relief from the public. For many years past the fund provided for assisting the deserving poor has been ample and systematic in its administration."

Then they proceed to point out that there are immigrants who have come in, and they say:

"The dead of winter is a period of peculiar hardship to the stranger without means. The case of these men suggested to the establishment of a soup kitchen, and this is being done in Toronto. Why can't the same thing be done here. It is a simple, effectual and inexpensive way of feeding the hungry, and, we think, a natural and necessary part of the relief system for the winter months. The existence of a public soup kitchen would protect householders from the importunity of tramps, while it might greatly assist in the general relief work of the city. Once before a soup kitchen was established here with excellent results, its operation was regarded as a blessing, and large numbers took the benefit of it. We throw out the suggestion at this time, because any such attempt at Christian charity on an organized scale, in view of the hard winter weather, and the presence of many strangers, as well as citizens to whom such aid might be welcome, would seem to be in order."

Why, haven't I been at meeting after meeting in which I was told "no soup kitchen now!" Haven't I often heard Ministers of the Crown pointing to the circumstance that there were no soup kitchens now? I am not at all certain that the hon. Postmaster General himself, in some of those orations with which he has enlightened the Western Peninsula, has not alluded to the paucity of soup kitchens and to the fact that that industry no longer existed. And now, in the very city which he represents, his own organ proposes, as a necessary thing, as a sort of pen-

dant to the National Policy, the establishment of a soup kitchen.

Immigration.

And I observe that one of the aldermen has stated that there are at this moment in that city between 1,300 and 1,400 immigrants out of employment. I am very glad to hear that, although the sum stated of immigrants does not come up to the moderate expectations, as they were called, indulged in last Session, it reaches so large an amount. We were told that we could have at least 150,000, and that, we were told, was an extremely moderate estimate; we are told to-day that the sum is 133,000. This is a very satisfactory approximation to the estimated amount I am not quite so certain how these figures will stand scrutiny. My difficulty is increased by the discrepancy of the statement to which I alluded a while ago, because the hon. member for Glengarry told us, that there were 94,000 of these who had come in from the United States. The hon. member for Levis stated there were 40,000. Where the 6,000 are I do not exactly know. But, Sir, I pointed out last Session—and I will not enter into the figures to-day at all, as I will have occasion to deal further with the subject later on—that there must be something radically wrong with these returns or with the result deducible, from what information we can obtain. Whether you draw it from the census, or whether from the municipal returns, there is, to a large extent, a displacement of the native by the immigrant population, and the immigrant population, instead of being stationary, is to a large extent, transitory. I say it is impossible to draw any other conclusion from the statistics which are before us, than that with reference to the figures which have been given. I repeat, also, what I have said upon a former occasion, that the yearly returns from the Province of Ontario, which are the only yearly returns to which I believe we

have access, indicate that the ratio of increase of the population, during the four years which preceded the last four years, was much greater than in the last four years. And it is an extraordinary circumstance, that that holds good, not merely with reference to the rural population of Ontario, but with reference to the urban population also; and that during these four years, in which it has been said the prosperity of that Province was so greatly increased by the operation of the Tariff policy of the Government, the ratio of increase of the urban population is markedly lower than it was the preceding four years that were stated to be years of retrogression. Now, this object is treated in the Speech in a rather perfunctory manner. We are told, that there has been a large immigration, and we are told further that improvements in reference to the facilities for inland transportation, will help us in the next year. But, Sir, I expected much more upon this subject in the Speech, and I am sure that the hon. member for Levis, who spoke so strongly on the importance of repatriation, must himself have felt—though he did not deem it loyal to express it—a sentiment of disappointment in the fact that so little has been said upon this subject in the Speech.

Legislation of the Session

Mr. Speaker of late years it is not only the Speech from the Throne that we learn of the intentions of Ministers as to the legislation of the Session. The hon. Minister of Public Works, at a banquet that was given to him in Montreal in October last, pointed out what was to be done in this particular regard. I propose to supplement the information conveyed to Parliament in the Speech from the Throne by a few passages from this ministerial pronouncement. The hon. member declared that there were three great questions upon which the Gov-

ernment claimed the confidence of the community, three great measures of policy—the Confederation itself, of which he claimed sole credit for the Conservative party; the Canadian Pacific Railway, which he did not then tell us required our further assistance, the National Policy. Let me and read. The hon. gentleman says:

“And, gentlemen, this demonstration is also an approbation of the great measures which have been adopted by the administration of which I am a member. First, there was the Confederation Act, and since we returned to power, we have adopted the National Policy, and the great Pacific Railway measure, and finally, we have adopted another measure scarcely less important in respect to the encouragement of immigration into this country.”

Adverting then to the history, according to his version, of the other three measures, he recurs to the immigration measure, and he says:

“But, gentlemen, our mission would be but half accomplished if we forgot that we have on the other side of latitude 45 a great number of our fellow-countrymen who would like nothing better than to return home and sit down to the family table and eat with us, and to earn their living under the institutions now existing in Canada. (Loud cheers.) I need not say, gentlemen, that it is with the greatest satisfaction and pleasure that I am able to announce to you this evening that the Government of Canada intend to take measures, and energetic measures, to recall into the limits of our own territory all our fellow-countrymen in the United States who desire to return and live with us. You will understand, gentlemen, that in a banquet like this I must be excused if I do not give all the details of the ministerial measure that we propose to bring down next Session. But in any case it is well that you should know that our compatriots in the United States, whether they be of French origin or of any other origin, they are not forgotten, and all that can be done to bring them back to this country we shall do most heartily.”

This was heralded in October last by the Minister of Public Works as the fourth great claim to the confidence

of the country, and he placed it upon a par with those three other claims to which I have referred: Confederation, the National Policy, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. He announced the formation of a scheme, the decision of the Government, the determination to bring down some scheme this Session to produce this end. Is this little peddling paragraph about cheap inland transportation the hon. gentleman's great scheme? Is it, or is it something else? And if it be something else—if it be something at all commensurate with the grandeur, not to say the grand eloquence of the language with which the hon. gentleman announced the scheme to his friends at Montreal, why do we hear of cheap inland transportation and hear nothing at all of the hon. gentleman's great scheme of repatriation? Why is the less inserted, and the greater omitted? Why, to an assemblage of Conservatives in Montreal, is a measure equal in importance to the National Policy, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Confederation of the Provinces to be announced, and Parliament itself not to be told a word in regard to it in the Speech from the Throne? Mr. Speaker, I said that there was distress in the city in which I live, and that it was partly due to special circumstances, not due altogether to those circumstances to which I had alluded. It is due to immigration. I am not about to discuss at this moment who is responsible for those circumstances, but I say that it is lamentable that the number of people that are there should be there under the circumstances under which they are there; and I repeat what I have stated on former occasions, that while this country ought to devise and encourage a system of immigration, while we ought to see that those whom we want are summoned and welcomed here, yet discretion is to be used; and the hon. gentleman's scheme of assisted passages, which he professes to us—though some of the documents I have seen do not appear to

bear him out—is confined to agricultural labor, is, so far as I can make out, in its practical operation, extended to the bringing into the country, by virtue of government funds, certain classes of people for whom we have no room, viz: mechanics and artisans. I believe that a considerable number have been brought into the country under the auspices, and partly by means of the assistance given by the Government, who had been better in the country from which they were brought. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken, have referred to the proposed legislation of the Session. It is not very new to us, because we had those Bills before us last Session. I do not intend to say a word upon either of them that I said last year.

Franchise Bill.

At the opening of the Session I pointed out what I thought was the true view with regard to the Franchise Bill; I will not repeat those words today. The Bill has been before the House, it has been before the country, but it has not yet received the advantage of explanation and vindication at the hands of its proposer, and I will reserve, for the present, any remarks I may have to make, until we hear from him, his vindication of the various provisions. This only I will say, that when I spoke last Session I did not and could not know that the measure would contain a provision so objectionable, so arbitrary, so unheard of, as a provision which the hon. gentleman proposed then, and which I hope he does not propose to embody in the Bill he is about to introduce, namely, that with respect to the appointment of revising barristers.

Factory Bill.

With regard to the Factory Bill, there is another reason for saying nothing just now, because the hon. gentleman states it is to be introduced with further amendments. I only express the

el to agricul-
I can make
ation, extend-
the country,
ut funds, cer-
for whom we
mechanics and
a considerable
ught into the
ces, and partly
nce given by
ad been better
ch they were
ntlemen who
ed to the pro-
Session. It is
ause we had
t Session. I
a word upon
d last year.

II.
ession I point-
was the true
the Franchise
ose words to-
n before the
s the country,
ed the advan-
vindication at
and I will
any remarks
until we hear
ation of the
is only I will
ast Session I
ow that the
provision so
y, so unheard
the hon. gen-
and which I
e to embody
to introduce,
t to the ap-
prisers.

y Bill, there is
ing nothing
n gentleman
ed with fur-
y express the

hope that when introduced it will be found to give as efficient a measure of protection to artisans of whatever age or sex in this country as is given to artisans in England. There is an omission or two in the Speech to which I must refer.

The Fishery Exhibition

is mentioned, and the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Reply have spoken with great and lively admiration on the success of that Exhibition, and of the triumphs which Canada there achieved. But we have some fishery interests which are to be promoted in other ways than by attending Exhibitions; there are some fishery clauses in a treaty, which clauses have been denounced, and which are to come to an end at no remote period; and I think some reference to that circumstance and to an intention to take the House into the confidence of the Government as to the course proposed by them, and to indicate what the Government have done in view of the approaching termination of the Fishery Clauses of the Washington Treaty, would have been at least as much consequence as the paragraph which has been inserted in the Speech. It is very well known that within the last two or three years more particularly, the chief market for our fish has been the United States, and it has become of very pressing importance that we should know what the results are to be of the termination of these Fishery Clauses. It is of importance that the treaty should not terminate without an earnest effort in advance to make proper arrangements, so that there shall be no gap, if it can be avoided; and I will add that it is of great consequence also, and the times appear to be more propitious now than in former days, that in those negotiations due attention shall be paid to arriving at some mode of restoring freer trade relations between us and our neighbours than have for some time subsisted.

Provincial Rights.

The hon. gentleman (Sir J. A. Macdonald) last year adopted the plan of referring to the judgments of the Privy Council in the Speech from the Throne, and we had a Ministerial exposition of a judgment of the Privy Council. But I am sorry to observe that that good custom is not followed this year. Some years ago, the Government, of which I happened to be a member, finding a decision of the Court of Queen's Bench of Lower Canada in favour of the Provincial right to escheats, decided to abide by that decision—which was in accordance with my own view of the respective rights of the Provinces and the Dominion—and acting accordingly we made no effort at that time to assert any right on the part of the Dominion, at a subsequent period that decision was concurred in and adopted by the Appellate Court of the Province of Ontario, and so strengthened, the case came before the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite. They decided to adopt another course, Centralizing, as I have often charged the hon. gentleman with doing—centralizing wherever he can, with his eye set always upon that one object of drawing to the general legislature and government, all the powers and functions which he can by any possibility draw to it, the hon. gentleman said, although the former Government adopted this view, although the highest court of Ontario adopted it, although the highest court of Quebec adopted it, we will fight them and endeavour to secure for the Dominion the right to escheat. He took up the case, he instructed the council, he paid the fees, the case went to the Privy Council, and the hon. gentleman was beaten. The result has been to establish the provincial right in this regard contrary to the views he entertained, and in accordance with the views and judgment of two provincial courts to which I alluded. I congratulate those who are lovers of our Federal Constitution upon this vindication of one

of its important elements—not that the question of checks itself is of much consequence; but because it was, as I said, the means of vindicating one of the most important elements of our Constitution. I congratulate them on the failure of the hon. gentleman in attempting to arrogate to his Administration and this Legislature, a power which was not its right. But when we have an important decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council settling a question of this kind finally and conclusively—not settling it in a manner susceptible of discussion, but settling it absolutely, why should not we be informed that our Constitution has been definitively settled and expounded in one important matter?

It being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

AFTER NOON.

The Liquor Question.

MR. BLAKE. Another omission from the Speech, yet more inexcusable, having regard to the language of the Speech last year, is the failure to refer to the judgment of the Privy Council in the Hodge case, bearing upon the liquor question. And as the First Minister adverted to the speech in which he made the statement with reference to the effect of the decision in *Russell v. The Queen*, I suppose I may without impropriety myself refer to it. The report of his speech which was delivered early in the month of June, 1882, from the *Mail* newspaper, is as follows:—

"The following question in writing was here handed to Sir John:—'What is your opinion of the constitutionality of the Ontario License Act?'"

"Sir John said that since Confederation his decisions had often been given as Minister of Justice on constitutional questions, and in no single case had his judgments been reversed. He believed that the Act was not worth the paper it was written on. The whole system of Government appointing license inspectors to compel men to

vote under penalty of losing their licenses was wrong and indefensible. Whenever the licensed victuallers brought the matter before the courts it would be decided that the Act was an usurpation, and had no force whatever, and he was surprised the question had not been pressed long before this. If he carried the country, as he would do, he would tell Mr. Mowat, that little tyrant who had attempted to control public opinion by getting hold of every little office, from that of a division court bailiff to a tavern keeper, that he would get a Bill passed at Ottawa returning to the municipalities the power taken from them by the License Act."

Well, in the course of the debate on the Address, I took leave to point out that there were some serious questions to be settled before the views expressed in the Speech from the Throne ought to be adopted by Parliament; and in answer to the position which I then took, not in detail, because I pointed out that the judgment had not then been circulated, the hon. gentleman made some remarks. I had charged the Government with a centralizing tendency. I had charged them then, as I charge them now, with a desire to draw in here whatever they can of power and jurisdiction, and of diminishing so far as in them lies, the power and jurisdiction awarded by the Constitution to the Provinces. In answer to me the hon. gentleman said:

"That subject was not willingly undertaken by the present Government. They were quite satisfied that the law as it obtains in the different Provinces should be continued. They were quite satisfied that each Province should, as far as the law would allow it to enact such statutes, deal with the subject of shop, tavern and saloon licenses. Neither the Government nor the Parliament of Canada, I take it, wished to interfere; and it was only when the decision which was given in June last on the Scott Act, a Dominion Act, and the subject was forced upon them, that they thought it their duty to bring it before Parliament. I never had any doubt that when the question was brought before the courts, it would be decided that the different Provincial Legislatures had no right whatever to deal with that subject; except

ing their licenses
sible. Whenever
ought the matter
be decided that
on, and had no
was surprised the
ness long before
country, as he
Mr. Mowat, that
tempted to control
hold of every
a division court
that he would
wa returning to
ver taken from

the debate on
re to point out
ious questions
views express-
the Throne
y Parliament;
ition which I
il, because I
ment had not
e hon. gentle-
I had charg-
a centralizing
d them then,
th a desire to
they can of
nd of dimin-
es, the power
by the Coun-
In answer
said:

ingly under-
ment. They
the law as it
vinces should
quite satisfied
far as the law
statutes, deal-
n and saloon
ment nor the
it, wished to
the deci-
last on the
nd the sub-
that they
ng it before
y doubt that
t before the
that the dif-
had no right
ject, except

for revenue purposes—for the purpose of imposing taxation for Provincial or municipal purposes. I expressed this opinion in Parliament years ago, and last year I expressed it at a public meeting in Toronto or its vicinity. But while that opinion was strongly impressed upon my mind I took no steps, nor did the Government of which I was a member take any steps for the purpose of interfering with the legislation of the different Provinces, or forcing Dominion legislation on the country, or trying to centralise such powers in this Parliament. On the contrary, the only centralization on that subject—the only time in which that question was in any way dealt with by the Dominion Parliament—was when the late Government was in power, and when they introduced the Scott Act."

Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to say with reference to Russell vs. The Queen:

"It is quite clear to every lawyer, and any man who is not a lawyer, who reads that judgment, will see that the very reasons on which the Privy Council decided that this Parliament had the right to deal with the Scott Act, are the reasons showing that the Provincial Legislature of Ontario had not a right to deal with that subject under the Crooks Act, except as a matter of revenue for municipal or Provincial purposes. The hon. gentleman says that we should have allowed the matter to stand over until it was finally decided. Sir, if there be any value in that decision, and there is every value in it, because it is the law of the land, there is no check at this moment in the Province of Ontario against the unlimited, unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors. This is not a matter we can play with. It is not a matter of policy; it is a matter of necessity. If we wish to prevent the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors we must legislate immediately; for I take it, that any man in this city or in any other part of Ontario can open his saloon and sell liquors, and there is not a court in the world that can prevent his doing so."

In answer to these views, I took leave to say:

"He said that any lawyer, or any other man who is not a lawyer, who chose to read that judgment must see plainly from it, that the unavoidable result was no

power was left with the Local Legislatures to restrict the number of licenses. Now, I do not draw that conclusion from the decision in Russell vs. The Queen. In the first place, that judgment does not deal in the slightest degree with, does not touch in any way upon, that very large part of Provincial rights which is comprised in the subject of municipal institutions. The decision is expressly stated to be upon the consideration of whether the power to pass the particular law which was before the Privy Council, viz.: the Scott Act, was vested in a Local Legislature in either of the then headings: the heading of property and civil rights, the heading of shop, tavern and saloon licenses, or the heading of local and private matters. The Judges expressly say that these were the points which were raised before them, and upon which they judged. They do not say a word about municipal institutions having been suggested or argued. Now, Sir, if hon. gentlemen sitting in this Parliament, if Ministers of the Crown, chosen from all the different Provinces, do not know what are the local laws touching the sale of liquor, what powers have been given to the different municipal bodies in that regard; if we require to-day to take the first step in order to inform our minds upon the mixed question of law and fact as to what are the laws and what mean the laws; can we suppose that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was inspired to know all about those municipal institutions and local laws which were not even alluded to in the argument and the judgment? Can it be seriously argued before a Canadian Parliament, that the single decision of four or five men—when the great question of municipal institutions was never even raised or discussed—has so finally concluded this question that it is no further arguable? It is absurd to say so. I maintain, that in the absence of a decision in which the whole question of municipal institutions shall have been brought up expressly, in which that mass of statutory learning which is required in order to know what the position of the municipal institutions of each Province was at the time of Confederation was not called for, in which the true construction of this phrase "municipal institutions" was not fully debated and decided—no man, in the absence of such a decision, can say that this question, which, in the largest of the Provinces, in the next largest of the Provinces and in two or three more of them, was dealt with before Confederation, and

for years after, as a subject of municipal institutions, is not to be found in the Confederation Act."

Once again I proceeded to point out what was done in the old Province of Upper Canada, under the heading of municipal institutions, and also in Lower Canada; and I said;

"I deny his construction of the decision in Russell vs. The Queen, and the argument in Russell vs. The Queen. I have read the stenographer's notes of the whole argument, and it seems to be unfortunate that a constitutional case of this high consequence, the senior counsel, a man whose knowledge and power and eminence, everybody knows and respects—Mr. Benjamin—should have been absent, and that the brunt of the argument should have been borne by the junior counsel. Mr. Benjamin appears only at the close in delivering a short and a concise argument. I say the argument is not satisfactory; and the judgment is not satisfactory, even as far as it goes. But the question is, how far it goes? We are not to take it as far as the hon. gentleman says it is to be taken. The hon. gentleman says: a lawyer reading that judgment will come to any other conclusion; he says no layman would come to any other conclusion. But lawyers have come to a different conclusion; judges have come to a different conclusion; courts have come to a different conclusion; and what the hon. gentleman declares no man would say, some of the highest and most respectable and esteemed judges of this land have already said."

And I pointed out in detail what the judgments were which bore out that proposition. After doing so, I said:

"For myself, I never will consent that one of the greatest powers given to the Provinces, shall be swept away by a court before whom this question of our municipal institutions was not argued or considered, before whom it was not considered that our powers in that respect were in question, and of which they were more than the messengers at the door. I will not consent that the Parliament of this country shall, without my protest, arrogate to itself the power to take away from the Provinces that great right, until we find, on full argument and consideration, that such is the meaning of our Constitution."

Well, Mr. Speaker, making these observations upon the motion of the hon. gentleman to initiate this legislation, which I opposed on this and other grounds, I was answered from the Ministerial benches by an hon. member, who said, speaking for the Government:

"They do not ask this House to consider whether the license question may be dealt with by the Local Legislatures or by the Dominion Parliament. This is a foregone conclusion, and his Excellency says, he is advised upon that question that the Provinces have no right to deal with the question; and, therefore, this House being seized with the case, and being satisfied that the opinion of the hon. the First Minister is the true one, is asked only to assimilate the laws of the several Provinces and to see that an Act is placed on the Statute-book, which shall satisfy the several Provinces."

Again, he said, referring to my point, that the only excuse that the Government had for introducing the measure, was the speech the hon. gentleman made in Yorkville:

"Well what better evidence does this country want of the great constitutional knowledge of the right hon. gentleman than the fact that he predicted, three weeks before the decision was given, that jurisdiction lay alone in this Legislature; that the Local Legislatures had no control over that question. That shows his great constitutional knowledge and his opinion of what the law really was, because a few weeks afterwards, we find the Privy Council endorsing his view."

However, although we voted against the initiation of this legislation, and declared that it ought not to be commenced, at a later day, when the Bill was to be read the third time, we recorded another proposition, to which I desire to refer. That proposition was contained in a motion, moved by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) in amendment to the third reading of the Bill, to leave out the words for the third reading, and insert these:

"The Provincial Legislatures have since

Confederation exercised Legislative power in the regulation of the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the hours and certain other incidents of the sale.

"That the Appeal Courts of Ontario and Quebec have each decided in favour of the exercise by the Province of the Dominion, of the jurisdiction, and this Appeal Court has further determined that the judgment of the Privy Council in Russell, and the Queen does not decide that the Provincial Legislatures have not this jurisdiction.

' That the questions involved are now under the consideration of the Supreme Court of Canada, and will shortly be brought under the consideration of the Privy Council.

"That the Parliament of Canada should not assume jurisdiction as proposed by the said Bill, until the question has been settled by the Court of last resort."

That motion also was defeated. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us understand clearly what determination we are called upon to take, for what reason and upon what plea; we were called upon to interfere with the regulation of licensing in the various provinces upon the plea—not that it was a politic thing for this Parliament to assume that jurisdiction, not that it was a measure of policy or expediency at all, but upon the plea of necessity—that in order to prevent the unrestrained sale, by anybody who pleased, it was necessary for this Parliament to intervene; not upon argument, for argument was not resorted to in this House, to prove the necessity, but upon the plea that the necessity was proved and established by the judgment of the Court of last resort, which the hon. gentleman said was the final law of the land—upon the plea that the local laws were not worth the paper they were written upon—that they were usurpations; and in order to prevent these dreadful evils over which the hon. gentleman wept, resulting from the unrestrained sale of intoxicating liquors all over the country, he said we must act at once, and act decidedly, else the country would go to ruin over the quantity of liquor sold by everybody and drunk

by everybody else. Well, sir, we pointed out that the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the judgment in Russell vs. The Queen, was erroneous; that it did not establish the proposition he laid down; that it could not establish it because an essential element to a conclusive decision upon that subject was that the question of Provincial powers in municipal institutions should have been brought under the consideration of the court and adjudged upon by the court, whereas that question was not considered or adjudged upon at all. However, the hon. gentleman who answered for the Government said that they took the opinion of the First Minister, that they were willing to take his opinion on trust, and that as he wished it, not merely as an expounder of the law, but as a prophet, it was particularly unfortunate that I should have challenged his judgment. But time brings about its revenge. There were allusions in the course of the debate, and in this motion, to cases then pending—in a case before the Supreme Court of Canada at that time standing for judgment, in which judgment has since been delivered, and in which three of the judges, those who expressed an opinion on the question of jurisdiction, expressed the opinion that the Local Legislatures have regulative jurisdiction. There was a case alluded to which was about to be heard in the Privy Council. It was pointed out in a late stage of the debate that it was entirely unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to proceed so hastily, for he himself proposed that his Act should not come into force until May next, at any rate so far as the licensing power was concerned, and that he might well wait until the decision of the Privy Council was rendered. But he had some purpose to serve, and he insisted on Parliament coming to a conclusion. Parliament came to the conclusion he desired, and since then judgment has been delivered; and this is the second complaint I make of

emissions. Surely this judgment has more importance upon the question before us last Session than the judgment in *Russell vs. The Queen*. The question which was before us last Session was—What are the powers of the Local Legislatures with reference to the issue and regulations of licenses? That was the question. The hon. gentleman said they have no powers to regulate licenses—that they had no powers except with reference to the raising of revenue for municipal or provincial purposes; and he said: I prove it by saying that a particular judgment goes to show it. Now, we have got a judgment which shows this precise point. And as the hon. gentleman would not put this judgment, which does not go to show, but which does show, into the Speech, I do not propose to move in amendment that it be inserted, because that would be contrary to the *bien-séance* of parliamentary life, as we understand it to-day, but I will read it. After explaining, or attempting to explain, the decision in *Russell and The Queen*, and the principles on which that decision was founded, and coming down to the point in question:

"Their Lordships proceed now to consider the subject matter and Legislative character of Sections 4 and 5 of the revised Statutes of Ontario. That Act is so far confined in its operations to municipalities in the Province of Ontario, and is entirely local in its character and operation. It authorizes the appointment of License Commissioners to act in each municipality, and empowers them to pass, under the name of Resolutions, what we know as By-Laws, or rules to define the conditions and qualifications requisite for obtaining tavern or shop licenses for sale by retail of spirituous liquors within the municipality; for limiting the number of licenses; for declaring that a limited number of persons qualified to have tavern licenses may be exempted from having all the tavern accommodation required by law, and for regulating licensed taverns and shops, for defining the duties and powers of License Inspectors, and to impose penalties for infraction of their Resolutions. These seem to be all matters

of merely a local nature in the Province, and to be similar to, though not identical in all respects with, the powers then belonging to municipal institutions under the previously existing laws passed by the Local Parliaments.

"Their Lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question, when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of police or municipal regulations of a merely local character for the good government of taverns, &c., licensed for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct. As such, they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belongs to the Dominion Parliament, and do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act which does not appear to have as yet been locally adopted.

"The subject of Legislation in the Ontario Act of 1877, Sections 4 and 5, seem to come within the heads Nos. 8, 15, and 16, of Section 92 of British North America Statute, 1867.

"Their Lordships are therefore of opinion that in relation to Sections 4 and 5 of the Act in question, the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that in this respect there is no conflict with the powers of the Dominion Parliament."

Now, what the hon. gentleman averred was that it was the case according to his opinion, and that it was judged by *Russell vs. The Queen* that a Local Legislature could not pass any law to decide who should have a license, or how many licenses should be issued, or with reference to hours, &c.—that all they could do was to impose a license fee for provincial and municipal purposes, and that any body who chose to pay that fee, so far as the Local Government was concerned, must be entitled to a license and could not be restricted. That was the hon. gentleman's proposition. I say that proposition is condemned conclusively by the judgment I have just now read. As I have said before, the hon. gentleman is a centralizer. I dare say he may ask

ure in the Province, though not identical the powers then be- institutions under g laws passed by the

consider that the be conferred by the en properly under- regulations in the municipal regulations rater for the good s, &c., licensed for retail, and such as rve in the munici- ic decency, and re- d disorderly and ch, they cannot be the general regula- nence which be- Parliament, and do provisions of the t which does not en locally adopted. egislation in the Sections 4 and 5, heads Nos. 8, 15, of British North

therefore of opin- section 4 and 5 of the Legislature of powers conferred Act of 1867, and re is no conflict Dominion Parlia-

ttleman averred ise according to was judged by n that a Local pass any law to ve a license, or ld be issued, or , &c.—that all npose a license nunicipal pur- y who chose to the Local Go- ned, must be d could not be e hon. gentle- y that proposi- usively by the w read. As I gentleman is y he may ask

this Parliament—having passed this law under his misleading, as a question of necessity alleged by him to prevent a great calamity, which, more than any one in the Dominion, he is desirous should be averted; having asked Parliament to pass this law on the plea of the absolute nullity of the local laws regulating the sale of licenses—he may ask Parliament to say: Oh, well, after all, it is not necessary, but it is expedient; it is politic; and as a matter of policy it is better we should keep the power which, under another pretext, we took in our hands last Session. But I hope—it having been now established that that large measure of power which has been exercised by Local Governments since Confederation, is embraced in its intrinsic and essential principles, within the phrase “municipal institutions” and therefore devolves expressly, by virtue of the British North America Act, upon the Local Parliaments—the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that he did not lead Parliament correctly on a late occasion, that there was not that necessity arising from the nullity of the local legislation which he asserted, that there was not therefore any fact or cause which was alleged for that law, and that he will not seek now to draw us into conflict with the Local Legislatures on some other pretence of concurrent, paramount, enhanced, or mystical power. It may be that he will. He always desires to centralize, but let those who are lovers of the Federal Constitution, who admire the Federal principle, who believe that the well-being of this Confederation depends upon the large measures of local liberties reserved to the different Provinces, in this widely extended, different circumstance, and sparsely populated Dominion. Let those who entertain these sentiments resist the proposition which the hon. gentleman himself last Session disclaimed, the proposition that we ought to endeavour to intrude upon this question, to touch it at all, except from the necessity which he alleged,

but which has now been proved not to exist. The hon. member for Glengarry made a quotation, and he said I smiled when he made it. I did smile. I think *delenda est Carthago* was not a very apt quotation on a proposition for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I will venture to say to the hon. gentleman what occurred to my mind when he made his quotation. Whether unwittingly, I have no doubt, for I am sure he desires with the rest of us, the good of his country—whether all unwittingly by his undeviating support of all these measures to which I have been referring, by the course he has insisted on being pursued with the results I have indicated—he may not have been unintentionally, but none the less assuredly, accomplishing his motto with the slight change *delenda est Canada*. The hon. member for Lewis called, in the course of his address, for a consideration of the peculiar condition of the Province of Quebec. He pointed out its special rights. I would say to the hon. gentleman that when he has adorned this Parliament a little longer, he will find that if there is one thing this Parliament is disposed not to do, it is to meddle with Quebec; and he will find any danger which Quebec runs, is because it is not always the case that the hon. members from that Province—and I have one of them now in my eye—who are, or make themselves, the special guardians of its rights in this Parliament, are equally careful of the application of the same principles which they would desire to see applied to their own Province when the question concerns some other Province. I would desire him to remember that it is by a firm and careful adherence and a uniform and undeviating application to all the Provinces of the same hon. gentleman's principles of respect for the Federal principle of respect for the local rights, and by resisting, as endangering the whole fabric, any attempted infringement upon them in any one Province, that the views of

my hon. friend will ultimately prevail; and that, so long as we find jealousy in respect of those rights when they affect a particular Province, and indifference, or even a disposition to assist in their impairment, when only other Provinces are concerned, so long it is impossible to say that what the hon. gentleman wishes, namely the maintenance on a sound and immutable basis of the Federal principle, has yet been attained.

Changes in Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we met last year for the first time, I adverted to the many changes which had taken place in the constitution of the Parliament from the time we met before. Since that time several changes, even in this brief interval, have taken place—some of them expected, some of them unexpected, to one or two only I wish to allude. The hon. gentleman opposite has been relieved of the disagreeable and embarrassing necessity of making an election. He finds himself free from the necessity of choosing between the two devoted constituencies which claimed his hand, and both of which would have been delighted to stick to him if the law of this country permitted. But that spouse of his, so faithful while she adhered to him, has been unfaithful since, and another man sits for Lennox. I regret exceedingly, and I am sure the hon. gentleman regrets what his Toronto organ, with a fine appreciation of the fitness of things, calls "The temporary triumph of vice over virtue," which resulted in this election

Other faces we miss, and other faces re-appear amongst us. I shall allude to one only. We have lost John Pickard, a man firm in his political opinions, but who possessed the rare good fortune, I believe, of not having a single person on unfriendly terms with him in this House, who was a friend to everybody and to whom everybody was a friend, who had the singular happiness of evoking during his life those universal expressions of affection and sympathy which are too often suppressed until the heart they would have gladdened is cold in death. I see that I speak the sentiments of every man on both sides of the House when I say we mourn his loss. As I have said before, and as I said last Session, this new Parliament, changed as it was greatly then, changed as it is now, had before it a future, a future which it had to make; and I ventured to express the hope which I forced myself then to entertain that that future would be a bright one. That future has since become, in considerable measure, a past, and those hopes are dim. But, though much be taken, much remains. There is yet time, and even now, after the experiences of last Session, I will repeat the expression of the hope that we shall take heed to the lessons of the year, that we shall endeavour to repair the errors of the past, and if we cannot now achieve all that might have been achieved, we shall yet endeavour to do for our country what may, under present circumstances, be done for its best.